

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 remain pending. Applicants have amended claims 1, 6 and 9. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, U.S. Patent No. 5,467,434, in view of Lobiondo, U.S. Patent No. 5,287,194. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1, as currently amended, recites “a confirmation message presentation section for presenting to a user a screen indicating a confirmation message for confirming printing based on the acquired print setting information and accepting input by the user as to whether the printing is agreed or not.” The cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a similar feature.

The Examiner concedes that Hower fails to disclose the claimed confirmation message presentation section, and relies instead on Lobiondo to teach this feature. In particular, the Examiner cites Lobiondo’s col. 2, lines 64-65 as teaching the claimed confirmation message presentation section, and asserts that it would have been obvious to combine the cited disclosure with Hower to produce the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Lobiondo’s col. 2, lines 64-65 states “[t]he user is then informed where the job is being printed and when completion is expected.” This disclosure differs in several ways from the claimed confirmation message presentation section.

First, the cited disclosure does not mention a message for confirming printing based on print settings acquired from a print server. Instead, the cited disclosure merely describes informing a user of the location and timing of a print job that has been dispatched by a scheduler, without allowing a user to confirm printing. By contrast, the claimed “confirmation message presentation section” is used for allowing a user to confirm printing. An example of such a confirmation message presentation section is illustrated in Figure 4 of the specification.

Second, the cited disclosure does not describe “accepting input by [a] user as to whether the printing is agreed or not.” Rather, the cited disclosure merely describes providing information to the user, as mentioned above.

Because the cited text in Lobiondo does not disclose or suggest a confirmation message presentation section as claimed, Lobiondo fails to cure Hower’s defects. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claim 1, as currently amended, further recites “a resetting section for resetting the acquired print setting information in accordance with an instruction from the user if the printing is not agreed by the user, as indicated the input accepted by the confirmation message presentation section.” The cited references, taken individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a similar feature.

The Examiner cited Hower’s col. 4, lines 49-62 as disclosing the claimed resetting section. Applicants disagree.

The cited portion of Hower relates to a user interface (UI) 16 that allows a user to select parameters (i.e., “print job selections”) for a print job, and a combination examiner 37 that compares the selected parameters with “printer profiles” specifying capabilities provided by available printers in order to determine whether the available printers can perform the print jobs. Unlike the claimed resetting section, Hower’s UI 16 and combination examiner 37 do not reset acquired print setting information based on a user not agreeing to printing with the acquired print setting information. To the contrary, UI 16 merely allows a user to enter parameters; the entry of those parameters does not reset print setting information *acquired from a server*. Additionally, the entry of the parameters in UI 16 and the operation of combination examiner 37 does not entail any resetting function performed in response to a user input “accepted by a confirmation message presentation section” as claimed.

Because Hower fails to disclose a resetting section as claimed, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

The Examiner states that it would be obvious to combine Hower with Lobiondo to produce the subject matter of claim 1 because the combination would “enhance the system capability and user flexibility” of Hower. This statement does not constitute a reason to combine Hower with Lobiondo, as is required to show obviousness. Instead, it is a mere hindsight conclusion regarding the alleged result of combining Hower and Lobiondo. Because the Examiner has failed to provide any cogent, fact-based reason for combining Hower and Lobiondo, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 6 and 9 recite features similar to those discussed above in relation to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 6 and 9 are allowable for reasons similar to those presented with respect to claim 1. The remaining claims depend from claims 1, 6, and 9 and are therefore allowable at least based on their respective dependences.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection

with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772035300.

Dated: November 7, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By B Westover  
Benjamin P. Westover  
Registration No.: 56,612  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 400  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7325